

I. REMARKS

A. **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,662,863 to Sloniewsky et al. (“’863 Patent”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In order for a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, all claim limitations must be taught by a single reference. Applicant respectfully contends that the ‘863 Patent is simply cumulative of the Cicognani reference, which was cited and overcome in the last office action.

With respect to the ‘863 Patent, it, like Cicognani, requires that at least the teeth on one side of the belt be preformed, and the tensile cord attached on a toothed mold, *prior to putting the belt in the curing press*. This is an expensive step that requires a cylindrical mold with the proper number and profile of teeth for each belt size to be made. It negates the significant advantage of incremental molding in a planar mold, which is that many belt sizes (number of teeth per belt) can be made with the same tooling.

Based upon the foregoing, claims 1, 11 and 13 have been amended to recite “said belt slab not having pre-formed teeth.” The instant invention has no pre-forming step. All molding occurs within the planar mold. This amendment is supported in the instant specification. As shown in FIGURE 1, and page 6, lines 2-4, “FIGURE 1 shows a belt slab 10 positioned between a first mold half 14 and a second mold half 18 *prior to molding any teeth in the belt slab 10.*” (emphasis added). The belt slab in FIGURE 1 has generally planar sides before entering the mold, thus, there are no teeth pre-formed before putting the belt in the curing press.

The ‘863 Patent addresses a product design and/or process for making power drive belts with certain properties of the face reinforcing fabric and tooth stock. However, it does not

address volume errors inherent in the process. These are an issue in molding is done in a cavity of fixed volume as described in the '863 Patent.

Claim 6 is amended to recite that the belt slab is a "continuous loop," which is important for the function of the tensile cord. Because the belt is flexible, the form of the loop can be an elongated oval or a loop with straight sides and curved ends. Since it is flexible, the most simple shape it could take would be a cylinder, but it could also be coiled to a double layered spiral or many other shapes conducive to storage or transportation.

B. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 2 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Terhune in view of the '863 Patent. The arguments previously stated for the '863 Patent are equally applicable here and are incorporated herein by reference. Because the '863 Patent requires a pre-forming step to form the teeth in the belt slab, it teaches away from the present invention. Applicant respectfully states that there is no teaching or suggestion in Terhune of the '863 Patent to have planar molds to form a power drive belt without having a pre-forming step to form the teeth. Based upon the foregoing, Applicant respectfully contends that claims 1 and 2 are allowable.

The remaining claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious. Claims 3-5 were rejected under the '863 Patent in view of Wood or Terhone. Claims 7 and 8 were rejected over the '863 Patent in light of Takano or Terhone. Finally, claims 7, 9, 11 and 13-16 are rejected over the '863 Patent in view of Campbell or Terhone. These claims depend from the independent claims, which Applicant believes are now in condition for allowance. As such, Applicant respectfully contends that claims 3-5, 7-9, 11, and 13-16 are also in condition for allowance.

C. Summary of Arguments

The focus of instant application is a means of making dual power drive belts with accurate dimensions. The references, alone or in combination, do not solve the problem addressed and solve the problem, which is the subject of this application.

II. CONCLUSION

In response to the Office Action dated November 30, 2006, claims 1, 6, 11, and 13 have been amended pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.121. It is believed these amendments have placed the amended claims in conformance with the requirements of the Office Action. At this point, Applicant believes that the claims remaining in the case distinguish over the art cited and comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102, §103, and §112. As such, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROUSE MCDOWELL

April 27, 2007

Date

Telephone No.: (330) 535-5711

Fax No.: (330) 253-8601

/Heather M. Barnes/

Heather M. Barnes, Esq.

Reg. No. 44,022

Customer #26781

678262.1